DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 307 SP 025 585

TITLE	Testimony Presented at an Open Hearing of the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education (New York, New York, October 18-19, 1984). Volume III.
SPONS AGENCY	National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Oct 84
NOTE	77p.; For related documents, see SP 025 564-595.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Lifelong Learning; Preservice Teacher Education; School Organization; Schools of Education; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Recruitment; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS	National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Educ

ABSTRACT

Included are presentations on (or entitled): (1) role of schools of education (Lia Gelb); (2) teacher education programs (Katherine Sid); (3) "Quality and Quality Control in the Teaching Profession" (Hugh J. Scott); (4) "Educational Reform and Teacher Education" (Hugh G. Petrie); (5) teacher recruitment (Gladys M. Hannon); (6) school organizational structures (Robert A. Burnham); (7) teacher education as a life-long process (J. Lynn Griesemer); (8) improvement of teacher education (Robert F. Eagan) and (9) improvement of teacher education (Donna Chapin). (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TESTIMONY PRESENTED AT AN OPEN HEARING OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN TEACHER EDUCATION (New York, New York, October 18-19, 1984). Volume III.

ED250307

National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, Washington, DC.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 025 585

Lia Gelb
Associate Dean for
Programs in Education

Graduate School of Education
Bank Street College of Education

For Presentation To:
National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education

October 19, 1984

SP 025 585

The issues that have emerged in recent years have had to do with: Who are the persons who should become teachers; how do we attract those candidates to Teacher Education; how do we educate those candidates; and what conditions in school systems will enable those teachers to do their job and to remain in the schools. Recommendations have been made about teacher salaries, status, career ladders and more autonomy for teachers. In terms of teacher preparation, recommendations have been made about strong liberal arts foundations, more field experience, and better connections between the school and the academic institution. I subscribe to the importance of all these factors. But I would like to focus today on how Schools of Education, particularly graduate schools can make an important contribution in this area.

In his 1982 report, funded by the Ford Foundation, American Graduate Schools of Education, Harry Judge points out that while most teacher education takes place on the undergraduate level, graduate schools focus on those trying to get out of teaching toward other positions. While this is on the whole true, many graduate schools have pre-service programs which focus on the preparation of those entering the profession. My institution, Bank Street College of Education, is a graduate school with, among others, a pre-service as well as in-service teacher education program which has since its beginnings in the 1930s sought liberal arts graduates who wished to become teachers. It represents a model of student selection and education which addresses many of the concerns that have been raised.

One of the major concerns expressed in the debate on excellence in education is how to attract broadly educated, gifted adults to the field of teaching. Funding is proposed to enable undergraduate education programs to strengthen their liberal arts offerings. At Bank Street we have always believed that a rich, liberal arts background with a balanced distribution of

courses in the humanities and sciences is an important resource required for teaching. We, therefore, invite and welcome college graduates with liberal arts degrees to come to Bank Street. We offer those students academic coursework and supervised fieldwork experiences which prepare them to become classroom teachers. The program leads to a Master of Science in Education degree with specialization in Early Childhood and Elementary Education and N-6 certification in New York State. It is our experience that this kind of program attracts well educated candidates who have had time to learn about the world around them as well as about themselves and who have made a commitment to teaching as mature adults.

The focus of the discussion on admission requirements to educational programs has been primarily on scores and grade averages. Our experience is that a strong academic background does not necessarily predict a good teacher. If one of the important tools of the teacher is the person, then in the admission process and the preparation, the whole person, and how that person enacts him or herself, has to be of major concern. In addition to the application form, transcript, references and a personal interview, we also require a personal essay, and written reactions to descriptive situations representing teachers, children and administrators. This process helps us to know something about the candidate's commitment, empathy with children, openness, flexibility, willingness to look at self, reaction to authority, humor and warmth.

Once admitted, the pre-service student engages in one full year of study which includes coursework, a full year of student teaching experience in 2 or 3 classrooms representing a range of age levels, student populations and teaching styles, and an advisement process.

The objectives of the graduate coursework are to help the student to observe, study and understand the developing child as a learner; to understand the diverse contexts in which the learner acts and which act upon the learner; to plan and to carry out and evaluate curriculum. Further, the goals of coursework is to help students to be knowledgeable about the history of education, diverse approaches and to begin to articulate his/her own philosophy. It also serves to help students to plan, organize and maintain appropriate settings for learning; to understand and evaluate educational research and to work effectively with others in the educational and community environment.

Advisement which goes in tandem with student teaching is central to the program and seen as furthering personal and professional development. It includes the functions of the traditional academic advisor and field work supervisor but reaches much beyond those roles. A graduate faculty advisor works closely with each student and becomes familiar with the student's work in the field through visits and bi-weekly individual conferences. In essence each student and his/her advisor are partners in a shared undertaking: enhancing the growth of this unique person, the student, as an educator with the necessary competencies to enact the teaching role successfully. Far from traditional images of education as the transfer of knowledge from expert to neophyte or as training uniform models, the image in advisement is one of senior and junior colleagues setting individual goals, solving specific problems, attaining mutual insights, evaluating approaches and outcomes, and defining and refining values.

The student also becomes part of a small advisement conference group that meets weekly with the advisor. This setting provides an intimate forum for the sharing of emerging concerns, insights and problems and for the exchange of professional experience. Students use the advisement process to relate field

experiences to formal studies in a way that guides them to a deepening sense of professional competence and personal growth.

John Goodlad has found that most teachers teach as they were taught. We concur with that assessment. If our hope is for a teacher with a new vision who will advocate for change, be able to enact a creative teaching role and respond to changing needs, some intervening experiences will have to take place. The becoming teachers will have to experience role models in the classrooms where they are placed, as well as in the academic setting where they are studying, which represent this vision and enactment.

What I am describing is a model of teacher education which encourages a diversity of experiences in learning to become a teacher, combining active participatory learning experiences, practice in a variety of settings with a variety of role models, and theoretical underpinnings which students are encouraged to research and articulate for themselves. These need to be supported by supervision which leads to autonomy, not to acquiescence and compliance. By experiencing a model which departs from the concept and practice of education as one of taking in "knowledge" and giving back accurately what has been taken in, teachers can then from their own experience more effectively create those kinds of learning opportunities for children.

Much concern has been expressed in teacher education literature about the "washing out" of the ideas, ideals, approaches presented in coursework when the student is finally exposed to the reality of the classroom during the student teaching experience in the senior year of undergraduate training. In our model, student teaching and coursework are concurrent and integration of theory and practice is supported by the advisor who moves back and forth between these two worlds with the student. The integration of theory and practice is further ensured if the teaching faculty are professionals who come to their work with

adults after substantial experience as teachers of children. This same teaching faculty in their advisement role are in the schools with their students throughout the year. Their previous experience with children and the ongoing contact and interaction with the schools lend authenticity and credibility to their teaching. In my institution, in most instances, the role of the teaching faculty and the advisor working with students in the field, resides in the same person. They do not represent a hierarchical system where practice is demeaned. Most of them were classroom teachers before they were teacher educators. In an organic way theory informs practice and practice informs theory.

It seems to us, that this model which we find productive could bring to the field of teaching those college graduates who have just now become interested in teaching and those who were always interested but wanted a rich academic undergraduate experience for themselves. During one calendar year they can then concentrate on the task of professional education.

I would like teacher education institutions to explore the possibility of funding programs to support teachers into and during their first year of teaching. Serious support of this transition would be a substantive contribution to the field.

I would like to add a caveat. If we were to succeed in attracting those strong, motivated individuals to teaching and we were to succeed in helping them develop into strong, creative, self-generating professionals, how long would they stay in school system? In an article in the N.Y. Times, Oct. 12, 1984, Diane Ravitch refers to systems which accord teachers little respect, little chance to influence policy decisions, little time or flexibility for intellectual growth or collegial relationships with other teachers, and little chance to use their decision making skills and be autonomous professionals.

Therefore, to bring this enterprise to fruition teacher education institutions will have to involve themselves in policy making to create viable environments for teachers as well as children.

SEWARD PARK HIGH SCHOOL
350 Grand Street
New York, NY 10002
Dr. Noel,N. Kriftcher, Principal

My name is Katherine Sid. I'm a teacher and an administrator in a New York City public high school. I am here because I want to share with you some of my concerns about education, especially in the area of teacher training programs in the colleges.

1. In this country, people do not consider teachers to be equal in rank to other professionals such as doctors, lawyers, etc. We must first change this view. Teachers are the key to the success of future generations. A master teacher will have the greatest influence on our young people. Therefore, we must take a good look at how the colleges are preparing teachers so they can carry out their tasks and responsibilities well.

Most colleges have no direct linkage to the local school system. Consequently, they have little awareness of the needs of the local schools when they plan their teacher training curriculum. For years, schools merely accepted teachers trained by the colleges, no matter how adequate or inadequate their preparation might have been. The solution to the problem of inadequate training was to send teachers to take refresher courses or advanced degree programs, and to require them to participate in the school system's in-service programs.

The colleges must provide guidance that is adequate and relevant for prospective teachers. College administrators and counselors must have first-hand knowledge of the needs of local schools, the structure of the school system, and should have a thorough knowledge of the school curriculum and the special needs of students in the

district and high schools. In this way, prospective teachers will participate in a well-designed teacher -training program that will maximize their possibility of eventually becoming master teachers.

2. Most recently, the United States has seen a tremendous increase in Asian immigrant students who speak little or no English. Thus, the need for bilingually fluent Asian teachers is greater than ever before. However, it is very difficult to find qualified bilingual teachers. Teaching in two languages requires highly developed skills on the part of the teacher. One must not only be fluent in both languages, but also have expertise in a particular subject area. In addition, the bilingual teacher must be sensitive to students who have just been uprooted from a familiar way of life, and be acutely aware of possible conflicts in cultural values of the new and old country.

3. Teaching methodology should match the needs of various cultural groups. The approach that one takes when teaching newly arrived immigrants is quite different from the one used with average American-born students. Colleges should make this a point of emphasis in their teacher training curriculum.

QUALITY AND QUALITY CONTROL IN THE TEACHING PROFESSION

Prepared by: Hugh J. Scott, Dean
Division of Programs in Education
Hunter College of CUNY

Submitted: National Commission on
Excellence in Teacher Education

October 19, 1984

QUALITY AND QUALITY CONTROL IN THE TEACHING PROFESSION

The Reality

Potent social and economic forces are operative in the nation which give every evidence of producing dramatic changes in how teacher education candidates are selected, prepared, certified, employed, and evaluated once employed. These same forces are causing severe stress on institutions and individuals engaged in the preparation and continued professional development of teachers and allied practitioners. Teacher education is being pressed by state legislatures, state boards of education, state departments of education, school systems, and institutions of higher education to improve the quality of pre-service and in-service education of teachers. The push for reform in teacher education is national and will impact on all members of the teaching profession and on all institutions engaged in teacher education.

Robert Ebel probably speaks for the majority of adult Americans when he notes that when the learning of an individual student falters, it may very well be the fault of the student. But when the learning of an entire class or an entire school falters, more than likely, the fault rests with the teachers and the principal.[1] The public traces the alleged decline in public education to disjointed and non-demanding curricula and to teachers who are intellectually deficient, ill-prepared, and/or uncaring. Unlike some professors of education, the public does associate teacher educators with teachers and teaching with teacher education.

The public correlates the decline in the performance of elementary and secondary education students on standardized achievement tests with the decline in the quality of students who seek and gain admission to teacher education programs. Concerns about the quality of recent graduates from teacher education programs are grounded in "existing test data from the Scholastic Aptitude Test that have been widely publicized by the media."[2] Like it or not, the teaching profession must confront the reality that some of its practitioners are intellectually deficient, psychologically crippled, socially maladjusted, racially and ethnically prejudiced, and pedagogically ill-prepared.

While most teachers are competent and are skilled in their performance, teachers tend to be more dedicated to teaching than to the professionalization of their teaching. Unfortunately, not all teachers make appropriate use of the knowledge base and skills that are available, and some teachers do not have a strong service motivation and a lifetime commitment to competence. The limitations of the developed scientific base undergirding the pedagogy of teaching when combined with the complexities and diverse nature of performance demands confronted by teachers make it impossible for any teacher education program to proclaim with integrity that all of its graduates can perform satisfactorily in all or even in most classrooms, particularly in the schools of the urban centers of the nation. Some teachers--a minority--cannot teach successfully in any school setting. Some teachers--the majority--can teach successfully in most non-urban school settings and in some urban settings. Some teachers--a minority--can teach successfully in any school setting. Ironically, a teacher considered successful as a practitioner in a non-urban school setting has no assurance that his/her knowledge and skills can be applied with similar success in the most demanding of school settings in urban America. Success in teaching is often determined by where you teach as by how you teach.

While the knowledge bank on what teachers do that makes them effective is far less than we need to know, effective teaching is not impossible to identify. Effective teachers do identify competencies which most teacher educators would agree are critical to the repertoire of behaviors and skills needed in teaching. But the possession of the competencies alone does not produce quality in teaching. Certainly the fewer of the critical competencies needed for teaching that a teacher possesses, the less effective that teacher's performance will be in the classroom. But it is the art of applying the competencies in the classroom setting that separates the quality teacher from the pedestrian practitioner. The art and science of teaching are diminisned or enhanced by the teacher's comprehension of subject matter and command of pedagogy.

The best teachers are not necessarily those who are the most intelligent, but equally as certain, the best teachers are not developed from individuals who are intellectually shortchanged or scarred psychologically. The teacher best suited for teaching is one who is intelligent, articulate, and humanistic; who clings unequivocally to the principles of equal educational opportunity and quality education; who perceives the critical influence of external and internal factors which may facilitate or impede growth and development; who identifies and uses the personal, intellectual, and social development of students; who demonstrates mastery of the applicable content areas; who has a repertory of the pedagogical skills needed for the specific assignment; and who measures success by the degree to which students progress toward their potential.

Entry and Exit Standards

Any reasonable effort to upgrade the quality of persons permitted to enter the teaching profession and to improve the quality of practice of those who are in the profession ought to be welcomed and applauded by all in the teaching profession who are serious about their professionalism. I agree wholeheartedly with Richard Wiseniewski when he states:[3]

> If teacher education is to achieve full professional status, we must stop evading issues of quality. It is one thing to be cautious in our public pronouncements, but why do we so often speak of quality in hushed tones in our professional deliberations?

We, who are in the business of preparing practitioners for the public and private elementary and secondary schools of this nation ought not be in opposition to reasonable efforts to require prospective teachers to demonstrate an appropriate level of competence for entry into the profession and to demonstrate maintenance of an appropriate level of effectiveness for reemployment and tenure. It is possible and desirable to reject or to delay the admission of applicants whose deficiencies in their communicative skills and academic readiness indicate impediments that would significantly impair their performance as teachers. Also, the assessment of the attitudes and feelings of teacher candidates is of equal importance in teacher training as is the candidate's capacity to acquire the requisite skills and competencies. Few practitioners in any profession achieve the level of performance that places them in the superior category. No professional can guarantee that the exceptional practitioner will be commonplace. But professions ought to demonstrate a hostility toward mediocrity and to strive to make high competence commonplace.

Standards of competence for entry into the teaching profession and standards for competent teacher performance in the profession are essential to the professionalization of teaching and to the improvement of teaching and learning in the schools. An appropriate "safe" level of proficiency in the areas of competence deemed most essential for entry into teaching should be established before teacher candidates are recommended for initial license, certified by the state education agency, or considered for employment by a school system. In addition, teachers should be required to demonstrate not only maintenance of their entry level of effectiveness by an appropriate degree of improvement in performance before tenure or other extended contractual commitments are made. In the teaching profession, as in other professions, there is recognition of the fact that the practitioners in the profession cannot possibly learn all that there is to be learned about being a successful practitioner during the initial period of training for entry into the profession. The maximum development of teachers occurs during the period of practice rather than the period of preparation for practice.

Program entry and exit standards need to be sufficiently rigorous and well enforced to provide assurances that only students with promise and ability are admitted to and continued in undergraduate and graduate programs. An acceptance of the following premises in the admission of teacher candidates would enhance the quality of preparatory programs:

1. Admission to preparatory programs must be predicated on the candidate's ability to demonstrate satisfactory levels of communicative skills, acceptable patterns of individual and group behavior, and intellectual potential.

2. The standards for admission and retention in teacher education programs should refer to specific competencies rather than be based exclusively on a certain minimum grade point average.

3. While some flexibility may be exercised in judging readiness, the remedial or corrective assistance needed must not constitute such a hurdle that successful mastery of the advocated professional competencies is rendered impossible.

4. Teacher education programs should not accept those students whose remedial needs exceed the resources of the program to provide corrective assistance.

5. Proficiency standards should be clearly established at successive stages in the preparatory cycle so as to provide students with well defined and enforced sets of "benchmark" standards.

6. Emphasis must be on quality of preparation rather than on the number of teacher candidates.

Few teacher education programs are without fault in the establishment and/or enforcement of standards. Large and small teacher education programs can all be indicted in some measure for admitting ill-equipped students to teacher education and for recommending ill-prepared or ill-disposed students for certification for teaching. Quality programs in teacher education are those that

ensure that the beginning practitioner is:[4] (1) sufficiently competent to "survive" the first year of teaching; (2) moderately effective; or (3) highly effective. Quality control measures in the teaching profession should be focused on seven critical points in the preparation and practice of teachers:[5]

1. College admissions
2. Admission to teacher education programs
3. Student teaching and other field experiences
4. Completion of preservice preparation and institutional recommendation of candidates for certification
5. State agency certification
6. Employment
7. Retention and tenure decisions

The role of the teacher is multi-dimensional, and a multi-dimensional approach should be used in the evaluation of the teacher's substantive knowledge about the content of curricula, teaching methods, and child development, performance skills and strategies, and attitudes toward children, teaching and learning. Those who would rely on a single test to weed out all prospective teacher candidates who would not be effective teachers or to ensure that only graduates of teacher education programs who will make effective teachers are allowed entry into the teaching profession are misguided. Those who would oppose the use of equitable tests as a means of measuring various aspects of the competencies required for effective teaching are equally misguided. Teaching may be complex, but teaching ought not be devoid of appropriate standards for entry into and continuance in the teaching profession. The quest should be for multiple measures to assess the readiness or the potential of students who seek admission to teacher education programs, who seek certification for teaching, and/or who seek employment as teachers. Gregory Arnig, President of Educational Testing Service, cautions school officials and lay leaders about the limitations of tests in the evaluation of teachers. He notes that while tests can measure knowledge in subject matter and in educational principles, no test can adequately measure a teacher's sensitivity to children, respect for cultural differences, sense of humor, or dedication to the public good.[6]

Teacher Education and Teacher Educators

Pedagogy refers both to the act of teaching and the art and science of teaching. Teaching is an applied or clinical science involving services to people; using the processes of diagnosis, prescription, and implementation; and characterized by the creative integration of professional knowledge and skills' personal style, and teaching art.[7]

The teacher education unit is much broader in program and purpose than the work of the teacher. A school, college, division, or department of education has three primary functions:[8]

1. Adding to the professional culture through research and development activities.
2. Preparing professionals to use the knowledge and skills in the practice of their profession.
3. Cultivating personal commitments to the social purposes for which education in a democracy exists.

The professional school or college should be a model of the best educational practice known to the profession and society--philosophy, instructional strategies, and performance, organization, facilities, equipment and resources, experimentation and innovation.[9] B. Othanel Smith in A Design for a School of Pedagogy noted that a school is professional if its:[10]

-- sole purpose is to train personnel for a profession

-- program focuses on the development of practical knowledge and skills

-- program is designed without interference by other departments and schools

-- program is influenced by professional organizations and public criticism

The professional culture of teaching is the collective knowledge, skills, behaviors, attitudes, and values that constitute the bases for professional expertise and decision making. Teacher education is the process which transforms educated persons from lay citizens to professional educators. While recognizing the importance of a general education and of specialization in one or more subject areas, the significant difference between other college graduates and the professional teacher is pedagogy. Teacher education is rooted in the blending of theory and practice with the theoretical and practical aspects approached as inseparable components. Teacher education is most effective when it is campus based and field oriented and when it involves the operating schools and school systems and the organized teaching profession as well as the university. The better preparatory programs rely heavily on a carefully designed series of experiences in actual settings which are programmed to assist the student in mastering those skills considered mandatory for satisfactory performance as a teacher. Teacher education is a career-long process for the professional teacher.

Courses in the preparatory program vary in format, but most courses should stress the establishment of highly personalized interactions between students and faculty. The teacher education curriculum represents the teaching, learning, and supporting resources for the process that culminates in the development of a competent practitioner. Curricula for teacher education are composed of two major components: General Studies and Professional Studies. The professional preparation of prospective teachers is concerned both with the general education of students and includes the courses, seminars, readings, laboratory and clinical experiences, and practicum covered in the General and Professional Studies Components.

The classification of a study as general or professional does not depend on the name of the study or the department in which the instruction is offered; it depends on the function the study is to perform. The instruction in the subject matter for the teaching specialties is the basic responsibility of the respective academic departments with the identification and selection of the courses and other learning experiences required for the teaching specialty being the joint responsibility of appropriate members of the faculty in the subject specialty concerned and members of the faculty in teacher education. Many disciplines are important in the preparation of teachers but not all disciplines are equally relevant. The disciplines should strengthen the conceptual and valuational grounds for professional practice and support development of a level of personal understanding and involvement that distinguishes the professional from a technician. Teaching requires two types

of knowledge: the knowledge that is to be taught to the pupil and knowledge that that may be needed by the teacher as background for his/her teaching specialty. Prospective teachers need to understand the nature and interrelationships of knowledge; thus, the undergirding disciplines for the prospective teacher ought not be taught as separate and rigorous bodies of knowledge, each with its own self-sealed boundaries.

The criticism of teacher education is sharper, more numerous, and more diverse in its sources than at anytime in recent history. "There is a tendency to say that education - from academy to the common school - just isn't working right any more."[11] The challenges to the traditional role and authority of schools and colleges of education--both internal and external--clearly indicate that the issue of the professionalism of teacher preparation include but go beyond the issue of "how we develop professional schools with unique missions and accountability to the profession as well as ties and responsibilities to the academy."[12] Some critics advocate the removal of the preparation of teachers from schools and colleges of education with reform focused on the recruitment of prospective teachers from able graduates of programs in the liberal arts and sciences. The most disdainful critics identify teacher education as an unchallenging enterprise that is staffed by mediocre faculty who serve the least able students. The criticism that teacher education programs "overstuff" the prospective teacher with education theory and method courses while neglecting the acquisition of proficiency in subject matter is longstanding and widespread. Many practitioners for years have claimed that very few of their courses in pedagogy actually provided them with the experiences they need to survive in the classroom.

Yet, notwithstanding the spate of criticism, we do know significantly more about the practice and research of education than was known twenty years ago. Most teachers are prepared better pedagogically now than they were in the past, but teacher education remains an uneven endeavor. There are too many inadequately staffed teacher education programs which have received state certification and/or national accreditation. Too many teacher education programs have been caught up in the academic game of enrollments at any cost. "There are diploma mills that denigrate the substance of our profession."[13] By any standards, the caliber of those allowed to enter the profession has reached an unacceptable low. Certainly, many of the national reports are excessive in their criticisms of teaching and teacher education. But one has to be oblivious to the convincing evidence to deny that "Teacher education needs to be looked at, revised, upgraded, strengthened."[14]

Some of the problems of schools and colleges of education can be blamed on the attitudes or constraints of the college or university setting. The funding support formula which governs the allocation and utilization of funds for the administration of teacher education, more often than not, does not provide adequate institutional support for implementation of the multidimensional role of the teacher educator. The designated teacher education unit is rarely accorded professional autonomy over teacher education curricula. The reward system in higher education tends to discourage or deny promotional advancement to teacher educators whose excellence in performance is manifested in the clinical aspects of teacher education. But the resolution of these and other institutional constraints coupled with an onslaught of a dramatic increase in the number of highly able students entering teacher education would not produce an appropriate response to the demand for the wholesale reform of teacher education.

Quality also must be pervasive in the process of preparation and in the performance of those who do the preparation. If quality were easily attainable in any endeavor, then mere adequacy would not be the appropriate descriptive label for the products of most organizations. Quality is not a subjective phenomenon and is not produced by osmosis. Quality in teacher education, just as it is in other endeavors, results when performance expectations for all parties is critical to the achievement of the organizational mission are well defined and when the behavior of the principal participants is functional. Some practices in teacher education impede progress toward a quality preparatory program, and some practices virtually assure that quality will never be realized. The better teacher education programs get functional performances from teacher candidates, professors of education, professors in the liberal arts and sciences, and teachers in the schools. Teacher education programs vary considerably in the complexity of their mission, in the characteristics of their students, in the credentials of both their liberal arts, sciences and teacher education faculties, and in the institutional supports accorded to teacher education. But excellence is often the by-product of an organization with a well-defined understanding of what quality is and with an established track record of discharging its critical operations in an effective manner. Regretfully, the faculty profile in some teacher education programs does not present an acceptable pattern of excellence and does not inspire confidence in the program's capability of preparing teachers who understand and can discharge effectively the obligations of the teaching profession.

Reform and renewal in teacher education are needed. The following allegations may not be inclusive of the spectrum of criticism, but they provide sufficient food for thought and action:

Many of the courses in teacher education lack relevance to the problems and needs of practitioners and are deficient in academic content.

Across the nation, state requirements and teacher education curricula cannot guarantee that teachers who have met the prescribed requirements have much training in common, know how to teach, or even know their subject matter. Courses are frequently offered to attract rather than educate students, and credits are awarded to students for little or no academic work, even in some of the best universities in the nation. Much too frequently courses exist to fill the needs of individual faculty members, not to meet student needs. Thus, producing instructor-based professional curricula.

The escalation of grades in teacher education has not been correlated with greater mastery of the various competencies needed for satisfactory performance as a teacher. Some professors of education teach "method courses" in a manner that renders the content empty of any demonstrable principles of teaching and learning. Some professors of education teach didactically with little or no reference to the application of the subject matter to practical situations in the schools.

Many faculty in teacher education are not relevant to the mission of teacher education in terms of their professional preparation experiences, and/or motivation.

The not uncommon presence of teacher educators who are not current in their fields, who are not engaged in scholarship, and/or who are divorced from

practitioners in the profession significantly impairs the quality of teacher education and the credibility of teacher educators within the academy and the teaching profession. Some professors of education tend to absorb the norms which govern faculties in the disciplines and neglect the mission of teacher education. Many of the colleges and universities which have the most extensive involvement of professors of education in research and inquiry devote little, if any attention to the pre-service preparation of teacher candidates.

Teacher education has not established an effective professional relationship with practitioners in the schools.

Effective teacher education is a collaborative effort which involves the college or university, the organized teaching profession, the operating schools and the school systems, and the communities served. No teacher education program can achieve quality status unless the program reflects a linkage with the realities which confront the schools and unless teacher educators and practitioners are engaged in mutually beneficial collaborative ventures. A disjointed relationship often exists between teacher education and teaching. Teacher educators and teachers tend more to tolerate each other than relate as colleagues whose professional roles are highly interrelated with the effectiveness of each being dependent on the efforts of the other.

Teacher educators fragment the preparation of teachers.

Fragmented and frictional professional relationships within and between departments of the designated teacher education unit are common. Proponents of various fads, trends, and concepts in teacher education such as moral education, open education, bilingual education, special education, humanistic education, competency based education, futuristic education, elementary education, secondary education, vocational education, career education, childhood education, etc. do at times divide teacher educators into rival camps which produce schisms. Many professors of education see their role in teacher education restricted to their particular subject specialty. The inter-relatedness of the content covered in courses which focus on the nature and aims of education, the curriculum, the teaching and learning, is often ignored or inadequately treated. Some specialties are inevitable, but too many teachers enter the teaching profession so specialized that they have neither the skills nor feel any responsibility for instruction outside a particular narrow field.

Standards for entry into and exit from teacher education programs are low.

Program entry and exit standards in teacher education are often not sufficiently rigorous or as well enforced to provide assurance that only students with promise and ability are admitted to and continued in undergraduate and graduate programs in teacher education. Unrefuted reports indicate that students now in teacher education programs are, on the average, at the bottom of all college students in SAT scores and other measures. Few, if any teacher education programs are without fault in their establishment and enforcement of standards. The public's respect for the professionalism of teachers and teacher education may only be elevated when colleges and

universities are able to increase significantly the number of teacher candidates capable of successful practice in the most challenging of urban schools and stop recommending students for teacher certification whose deficiencies clearly reveal them as being incapable of successful practice in any school.

Teacher education has not established a collaborative relationship with the liberal arts and sciences.

The pedagogical education of those in the teaching profession cannot function without the contextual knowledge of the undergirding disciplines. Faculty in teacher education and faculty in the disciplines should participate jointly in the selection of courses in the liberal arts and sciences that are established to provide the general education and the content of the teaching specialty for the prospective teacher. But faculty in the disciplines in most institutions of higher education do not work cooperatively with teacher educators in shaping the general education and the subject matter of the teaching specialty for prospective teachers. Traditional relationships and prejudices are extremely difficult to alter in higher education. In the "cast and class" pecking order of higher education, departments in the disciplines tend not to accord very high status to their members who teach courses established primarily for those who pursue careers as teachers or who proposed curricular changes which are intended to be responsive to the general education needs of teachers.

Research and inquiry are not undertaken at acceptable levels by faculty in teacher education.

Teacher education needs professors who are scholars and professors who are scholarly. The notion that a professor of education can concentrate on teaching and ignore scholarship is fallacious and a rejection of the belief that the knowledge base of the teaching profession is strengthened when its theories and principles are constantly tested and demonstrated in first-rate professional preparatory programs. Pedagogy cannot be advanced without research and scholarship. But no school or college of education has equitably resolved how to accommodate both the clinical and research components of pedagogy within the context of the academic morals and policies of institutions of higher education.

Conclusion

Even the staunchest informed supporter of the teaching profession would agree that there is room for improved practice in the pre-service and in-service education of teachers. The perplexing and pressing problems of improving pedagogical education and teaching need to be addressed, and the meaningful and equitable resolution of such are fundamental to any comprehensive proposal directed to the advancement of teaching as a profession. The range of abilities in any school system is extensive, and the wider that range is the greater the demand placed on the skills of teachers. Teachers should know the body of knowledge and the repertoire of skills needed for effective teaching and how to apply this in the management of classroom instruction. No school system can achieve quality in its educational programs without benefit of the services of practitioners who have received a first-rate pre-service education and who continue to be reinforced by in-service

educational activities directed to their professional growth and development. No school, college, or division of education can achieve first-rate status unless its faculty represents an appropriate balance of teacher educators who can develop knowledge, communicate knowledge, and utilize knowledge as it interacts in collaborative and cooperative ways with practitioners in the schools.

Yet, a major renaissance in pedagogical education that is accompanied by the dismissal or complete remediation of all inept and incompetent practitioners in the nation's elementary and secondary schools would not guarantee satisfactory achievement in school for all students. The full measure of the resiliency of racial and socioeconomic discrimination and deprivation is impossible to determine. While it is arguable that a significant number of students suffer academic deficiencies which stem from poor schooling and from inept, incompetent, and insensitive teachers and principals, the behavior and performance of the student in school is a consequence of what happens outside the school as well as what happens in school. Good teaching and appropriate administrative support structures are essential to quality educational programs. But good teaching and adequate support structures only enhance the possibilities of learning; they do not in and of themselves guarantee learning. Learning is a far too complex process of inter-relationships involving teachers, principals, students, parents to have the failure of students in all or most circumstances automatically traced to what educators have or have not done. Good teaching can cure much but not all, and poor teaching destroys much and helps nothing.

10-19

gl
6/84

REFERENCES

1. Robert Ebel, "Three Radical Proposals for Strengthening Education," Phi Delta Kappan (February, 1982)

2. Adrienne Y. Bailey, "The Education Equality Project: Focus on Results," Phi Delta Kappan (September 1983)

3. Richard Wiseniewski, "Quality in Teacher Education: A Reply to Alan Tom," Journal of Teacher Education (November/December, 1981)

4. Frederick McDonald, "Evaluating Preservice Teachers' Competence," Journal of Teacher Education (March/April 1978)

5. Ibid.

6. Gregory Arnig, "Teachers Deserve Fair Evaluation," Development (Princeton, New Jersey: Published quarterly by Educational Testing Service, May 1982)

7. B. Othanel Smith, A Design for a School of Pedagogy (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1980)

8. Educating a Profession, Op. Cit.

9. Ibid.

10. B. Othanel Smith, Op. Cit.

11. Albert Shanker in advertisement column in "The New York Times, December 4, 1983

12. David G. Imig, "Some Perspectives on Contemporary Professional Education," in Are Schools of Education Professional Schools? from the Franklin B. Walter Conference sponsored by the State of Ohio Deans of Education, the Ohio Association of Private Colleges for Teacher Education, and the University of Dayton School of Education, (1980)

13. Ibid.

14. Albert Shanker, Op. Cit.

EDUCATIONAL REFORM AND TEACHER EDUCATION

Hugh G. Petrie, Dean
Faculty of Educational Studies
State University of New York at Buffalo

Somewhat surprisingly, the recent national reports on educational reform, with few exceptions, have had little to say about teacher education (Stedman and Smith, 1983). The major exception has been the Carnegie Foundation Report, High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. In this report Ernest Boyer calls for a revision of teacher education programs which would lead to establishing a five year course of study. Students would, typically, spend the first four years of their college careers pursuing a standard liberal arts degree. They would follow this experience with a special fifth year devoted to pedagogy, albeit a revised pedagogy from that currently in existence in most colleges of education. In the Carnegie program teachers would study four subjects--schooling in America, learning theory and research, teaching of writing, and technology and its uses--in addition to participating in a variety of clinical experiences.

Another report, Education for Economic Growth (1983), calls for improved standards of teacher certification. Changes in certification such as those called for in this report would eventually have an effect on schools and colleges of education. However, outside of these examples, most of the national reports simply do not address teacher education directly.

However, as many of us in colleges of education wryly remarked to each other when the national reports first began to appear, "Enjoy the lack of attention to teacher education while you can. We're next." And indeed we were. Once the broad-gauge issues of the national reports were translated into specific policy recommendations at the state level, teacher education began to receive its share of criticism and suggestions for reform. The cover story of the September 24. 1984, issue of NEWSWEEK, "Why Teachers Fail: How to Make Them Better," was mostly an attack on teacher education.

The various state-level initiatives and recommendations for educational reform along with the indirect implications of the national reports affect teacher education in a variety of ways. The problem is that many of the critics have taken only a superficial look at teacher preparation and the recommendations they make often do not reflect the critical analysis of the situation for which one might hope. Although the issues affecting teacher education identified by the critics are indeed important, the typical suggestions made for dealing with these issues are often indefensible. In some cases the common wisdom, if pursued, would actually make the situation worse, rather than improving it. In other cases, it is time for colleges of education to realize that teacher education is not a monolithic whole and that some radical reforms are in order. In what follows I will consider the issues of pedagogy, certification, tests, institutional variability, and continuing professional development as these affect teacher education.

PEDAGOGY:

Nothing seems so clear to many critics of education than the proposition that teaching teachers how to teach is a waste of time. According to this line of argument pedagogy takes time away from the subject matter that teachers must master. In addition, courses in "methods of teaching" are thought to be universally dull, boring, and without intellectual merit. Furthermore, it is claimed that a good internship with a practicing teacher is really all that is required by way of pedagogical training.

Perhaps the most direct attack on teacher education has occured in the state of New Jersey where traditional college-based teacher education has been by-passed entirely. As an alternative to the long-standing requirements for at least some courses in pedagogy in the preparation of teachers, New Jersey has established a system whereby any person with a bachelor's degree can become a teacher without any education courses at all. The only requirement is that the district in which the graduate is hired must provide a year-long apprenticeship program

Typically, the professional component of teacher education programs is composed of courses in methods, the behavioral and humanistic foundations of education, and student teaching. If courses in methods of teaching were to be eliminated and student teaching given over to practicing teachers, then only foundations courses would be left and they could probably be taught by liberal arts departments almost as well as they are presently

being taught in schools and colleges of education. In short, if there is no good argument for pedagogy, there is no good argument for teachers' colleges.

There is, however, a logical fallacy in the line of argument that suggests that education courses are unnecessary. The question is not whether anyone will learn how to teach. The question is rather where and how people will learn how to teach. Will they pick up hints in the teachers lounge? Will they simply model teachers they have had? Will they be able to reflect upon and improve their teaching? Will they have the knowledge of instructional theory, classroom management, and curriculum design to adapt to new and changing circumstances? There is a significant difference between those professions or crafts in which one can simply pick up the tricks of the trade on the job and those professions where a knowledge of the processes involved allows for critical reflection upon and improvement of one's performance. Perhaps plumbing can be taught solely by apprenticeship, but unless we wish education to stagnate, teaching cannot. If methods courses are inadequate, let us improve the methods courses. Let us not make the logical blunder of assuming that the question of how to teach will disappear if courses on how to teach disappear.

There is another point to be made in this connection. The last twenty years has seen a remarkable increase in our knowledge of how to prepare good teachers (Gage, 1984; Berliner, 1984). The effective schools research, the work on classroom management, direct instruction, and time on task, have all begun to place the practice of teaching on a firm knowledge base. As this work continues, it will improve our knowledge of how to train better teachers. This knowledge is not of recipes, but of principles. A knowledge of principles not only allows the practioner to deal with routine and repetitive situations, but also to adapt to novelty. Teachers cannot simply be technicians. They must make too many individual decisions about effective instruction every moment of the day to simply follow instructions, no matter how detailed. The total failure of some fifteen years ago to try to devise "teacher-proof" curricula demonstrates this point rather dramatically.

In any event, there is a widespread misconception of how much of a teacher's education really occurs in a teachers' college anyway. According to a recent study conducted by the Dean of Education at Texas Tech (Ishler, 1984), at the major universities in the United States, the average elementary education student takes approximately 25% of his or her coursework in education courses, including student teaching. The average secondary student takes slightly less. Thus, if Johnny's teacher cannot write a coherent note to Johnny's parents, the problem is probably that of the English Department rather than of the College of Education. It is important to note that this

study looked at practices at the major institutions in the country. It did not include regional universities or small private colleges. Thus, at least at many of the major institutions in the country, there is no substance to the claim that teacher education is under the control of "educationists" with no standards.

What this research shows is that the liberal arts are tremendously important in the education of a teacher. The best teacher preparation programs will combine the skills of faculty in education with those of faculty in the liberal arts. However, the contribution of the liberal arts is by no means limited to the content of what the prospective teacher will teach. As a member of a Task Force of Deans of Education in the Association of Schools and Colleges of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities, I have suggested four areas in which the liberal arts make, or can make, a critical contribution to the training of teachers (ASCESULGC/APU, 1984). These are in basic, or general education, the teaching of higher order skills of analysis and problem solving, the content area being taught, and in improved methods courses.

Basic education is clearly essential for good teaching. Teachers must be able to read, write, calculate, and have some general knowledge of the natural and social world in which they live. Higher order cognitive skills are essential for a teacher. Given the myriad problems of strategy, implementation, classroom management, and individualization in a modern classroom, it is

essential that teachers be able to analyze their situations, pose appropriate questions, and devise adaptive solutions to their problems. Such skills have traditionally been the province of training in the liberal arts, but have seldom been emphasized in a teacher education program. Knowledge of what a teacher is to teach, the content, is, of course, essential. The problem is that many people seem to believe that this is all that is required from the college or university experience.

The most interesting suggestion, however, is the idea that the liberal arts can also help improve methods courses. The assumption is that the goal of learning how to teach is to be able to relate the structure of that which is being taught to the student's cognitive map by means of effective instructional strategies. To carry out this kind of integrative task requires that the prospective teacher not only know the details of the discipline being taught, but its structure as well. It is only in that way that instructional strategies can be developed that ensure that the student is neither bored by too easy material nor frustrated by work that is too difficult. The liberal arts could, if they would, teach the structure of the disciplines, and contribute to the integration of that structure with learning and curricular strategy in truly challenging new methods courses.

What this discusion indicates is that pedagogy cannot be ignored. At the same time, it may well be too important to leave solely to teacher educators. The role of the liberal arts in teacher preparation is critical, not only in the content areas, but in a revised conception of methods of teaching as well. If

this is so, it is clear that five-year programs of teacher education are probably essential. However, given the key role of the liberal arts, it may be inappropriate to conceive of a five-year program as one of obtaining a bachelor's degree and then following that with a year's professional teacher training as has been suggested by many. Rather, an integrated five year program, with education cooperating with the liberal arts, could go a long way toward improving all of the skills of our prospective teachers.

CERTIFICATION:

All fifty states have some form or other of initial certification for teachers. Since education is a state resposibility, the state monitors the quality of teaching in a variety of ways, with certification being one of them. Typically certification requires competence in a variety of areas, including professional education as well as subject matter content. The concern over "unqualified" teachers, therefore, can take a variety of forms. It might mean a teacher who has not received the appropriate professional education training, or it might mean a teacher who has not had the appropriate subject matter courses.

One of the major difficulties for colleges of education with regard to certification has to do with the distinction between program approval and transcript evaluation. "Program approval" refers to that process whereby a state agency approves the program of a given college of education, usually as the result of

an independent evaluation, including a site visit. After approval all graduates of the approved program are automatically certified by the state. One difficulty has to do with the fact that once approved, programs are almost never disapproved, even though there is usually a nominal periodic review. Furthermore, program approval requirements vary significantly from state to state in terms of the quality and rigor of the standards employed for approval. Over the past ten years there has been an increase of over ten per cent in the number of teacher education programs approved nation-wide, while at the same time there has been over a forty per cent decrease in the numbers of graduating teachers (Feistritzer, 1984). The criteria for receiving program approval do not appear to be very rigorous.

Program approval is, however, a paradigm of rationality when compared to transcript evaluation. This system of certification, in use in some form or other in all states, involves an educational bureaucrat looking at the transcript of a student, counting up courses, and issuing certifications on the basis of the courses taken. The problem here for colleges of education is that students who might flunk out of an approved program at one school, can, nevertheless, shop around at other schools until they have completed all of the requirements for transcript approval, and then be certified by the state. The extent of certification by transcript review is large and growing. In New York, nearly fifty per cent of initial certificates are issued by the transcript review process (SED, 1983).

The only handle colleges of education have on the quality of

such students is that the colleges largely control the student teaching experience. Even here, however, there are moves afoot, as, for example, in New Jersey, to allow for alternative modes of practice teaching, thereby posing a serious threat to colleges of education in their attempts to provide integrated professional education experiences. A simple collection of courses does not necessarily constitute a real program.

One might point out, however, that there is no research on the differences that graduation from an approved program makes on the quality of the teacher. However, the research cannot stop simply with comparing the difference in effects between approved programs and certification via transcript review. The variability in quality of approved programs could end up obscuring any real differences which might be found between high-quality teacher education programs and teachers who are certified through transcript review processes. Colleges of education must face these certification issues squarely. If graduation from a high-quality teacher education program really does make a difference, then research should show it. Colleges of education should undertake that research. If graduation from an approved program does not make a difference, colleges should either improve their programs, or, perhaps, some of them should get out of the business of teacher education.

In addition to the certification issues surrounding the professional education component, there are also concerns with the content portion of certification. This concern has surfaced in the national reports and in state-level policy forums in the guise of worries about the lack of mathematics, science, and foreign language teachers. Many teachers in these areas, both experienced and newly graduated, are forsaking teaching in favor of more lucrative positions with industry and government. Thus, one hears of "unqualified" teachers teaching math and science.

Unfortunately, there seems to be a widespread conception that there are numerous technically-trained people in the country who would jump at the chance to become teachers if only they did not have to take all of those terrible education courses. Thus, the problem could be solved if we only waived the professional component of the certification requirements for these people. In all liklihood, this remedey will be tried. What colleges of education must do is to insist that such an experiment be monitored closely to see how many teachers can actually be attracted in this way, how well such teachers perform, and how long they stay. Once again, it is not that waiving the pedagogical component of certification requirements will somehow magically eliminate the necessity for these teachers to learn how to teach. As noted above, the question is rather how they will learn to teach, and how well they will teach.

There is another, more serious problem with the content portion of certification requirements. This problem can be illustrated by the situation in New York. Similar situations

occur in other states. In New York, because of union contracts, education law, and tenure policies, a district with a lack of qualified teachers in a given area, say mathematics, cannot simply go out and hire new mathematics teachers--at least if that would mean laying off any existing teachers. Rather the district must first ask existing teachers who might be redundant in another field, say English, to teach one of their five classes out of certification, in mathematics. This policy must be followed virtually throughout the system before the district can even begin to require the English teacher to start taking courses to become certified in mathematics. In areas of the country where there is still a declining school population, this situation often occurs. In such a case we do, indeed, have teacher shortages in certain areas, but cannot hire people competent in those areas whether certified or not.

The implication of this for colleges of education is a sort of catch-22. In an effort to do something for these teachers teaching out of certification, most of the colleges of education will offer some kind of "quick-fix" course in the new field so that the teacher does not approach the job totally cold. Districts may even aid and abet the colleges by providing incentives for such teachers to take these courses. However, no college of education can require the teacher to take the amount of work really needed. Then when parents complain that their children are being taught by unqualified teachers, the college of education will receive at least a part of the blame. It will be a rare college of education that will be able to

resist the temptation to gain additional enrollments by offering these quick fixes, especially since the colleges' budgets are largely determined by enrollments. Even if a college were not swayed by the self-interest argument, they might well believe that such courses would be better than nothing for the students who must learn from the unqualified teacher.

What colleges of education must do in the certification area will require courage and leadership. They must fight for more rigorous standards of certification. They must take up the challenge of demonstrating that completing a teacher education program really is superior to amassing a collection of courses. Perhaps most importantly, colleges of education must insist on stiffer entrance and exit requirements so that their students truly are well-qualified. If states then continue to insist upon less demanding requirements, the colleges can point this out. Otherwise, the strong teacher education programs will once again be lumped together with the weakest links in the teacher preparation system.

TESTS:

In today's context the call for stiffer requirements for teachers most often translates into tests of teachers. Over and above completing an approved program or amassing a set of courses, more and more states are requiring a variety of tests for certification. Most such tests are still aimed at beginning teachers, but several states, most notably Arkansas, are also requiring such tests of practicing teachers as well. Although

teachers' unions on the whole reluctantly accept tests for beginning teachers, they vehemently oppose them for experienced teachers. They argue, with some degree of logic, that other professionals are not required to continually demonstrate their competence, so why should teachers? The fact remains, however, that the use of such tests is here to stay and will doubtless increase.

These tests, the National Teachers Exam is a good example, tend to be paper and pencil tests purporting to evaluate a variety of areas. Typically these include communications' skills, general knowledge, professional education knowledge, and subject matter knowledge. Very few tests attempt to determine how well teachers actually teach. The reason for this, from a policy standpoint, is very simple. Tests which could hope to measure the actual performance of a teacher by observation, peer evaluation, administrator visits, student response, and so on would be enormously expensive, far more expensive than very many states seem able to afford.

Because of the expense of evaluating actual teacher performance, the alternative of assessing teachers by pupil achievement has been suggested. This procedure has at least two fatal flaws at the present state of the art. First, teachers are by no means responsible for everything that affects a child's learning. They have no control over television watching, latchkey children, poverty-stricken children, parental indifference, and so on. All of these things strongly affect learning as we well know. Until teachers do control such things,

it seems wholly inappropriate to judge teacher performance solely on student achievement.

Second, the state of the testing art simply does not allow us to measure very accurately the "value added" by any given teacher to a child's education. By this I mean that a teacher who brings a marginal child's performance up to average may have added much more value to that child's education than a teacher who brings a "B" student up to an "A". Yet in most schemes of measuring teacher performance by student achievement, the latter teacher would be judged superior. Perhaps the worst problem is that a single ojective test score does not even come close to reflecting the results of education. Professional test constructors understand this point, but policy makers often do not (Darling-Hammond, 1984).

Because of the difficulties of measuring actual teacher performance, most states have resorted to paper and pencil tests of an abstract knowledge which they piously hope will translate into improved performance. But there are significant problems with this approach as well. First, almost all paper and pencil tests correlate very highly with general verbal and mathematical ability. Good students will test well on these exams whether or not they can teach or relate to children at all. The other side of the coin is that minority students proportionately perform much less well on such tests than do other students. This is a particularly distressing policy result when we are faced with rapidly rising proportions of minority children to be taught. Indirectly this implies that schools of education have particular

challenges facing them in preparing minority students or other students who have low aptitude scores to pass these tests.

The most direct implication of the testing movement for schools of education, however, lies in the potential use of test scores of an institution's teacher graduates to judge the quality of the institution itself. Florida, for example, intends to close down teacher education institutions which do not have an acceptably high proportion of their students passing the state tests. If these tests arguably measured actual teaching performance, this would not be too bad, but in the present context, such a policy will largely affect institutions with large minority enrollments.

Nevertheless, there is certainly one area in which such tests do seem appropriate, and that is in the areas of communications skills, general knowledge, and subject matter competence. If would-be teachers do not know how to spell or write a grammatical sentence or are deficient in elementary and secondary subject areas, then they ought not be allowed to teach, no matter how well they relate to children. Colleges of education should welcome tests in such areas. In addition to improving the general quality of teachers, such tests will help focus attention on the liberal arts components of teacher education. If an institution's teacher candidates fail general knowledge tests, then questions can and should be asked of the quality of the liberal arts training those students are receiving in that institution. Colleges of education should welcome such a result.

INSTITUTIONAL VARIABILITY:

Recent studies indicate that the number of institutions offering teacher education programs has actually risen over the past ten years, at the same time that the number of teacher graduates has fallen by about half (Feistritzer, 1984). There are now nearly 1300 teacher education programs in the country producing approximately 150,000 graduates per year.

The most plausible explanation for this fact is that many small colleges, faced with declining enrollment figures have added teacher education programs because they are cheap, and, even in a glutted market, there are still fairly large absolute numbers of students desiring teacher training. Concomitantly, large, prestigious institutions have tended to cut back on basic teacher education, sometimes transforming their programs into graduate schools of education. Such graduate schools tend to be closer in spirit to the academic values of the rest of the institution, stressing research and scholarship at the expense of teacher preparation. It has been estimated, for example, that the 100 or so colleges of education comprising the Association of Schools and Colleges of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges produce less than 15% of the teacher education students in any given year. Yet these colleges of education are located in the most prestigious institutions in the country.

In addition to the variability of kinds and types of teacher training programs noted above, there is also the much-noted fact that on a national level, students indicating an interest in teacher education on SAT applications tend to have the lowest

scores of almost any students. This fact is a major piece of evidence cited for the declining quality of teachers. At the same time several studies indicate that, at least in some institutions, teacher quality as measured by test scores and grade point averages is very similar to the average quality of all students at the institution. This seems to hold true for the California State College system and for the units at the State University of New York. However, when one puts together the variability of teacher training institutions with the possibility that would-be teachers are close to the overall quality of the institution from which they graduate, an interesting possibility emerges. It may be that the low average quality of teachers nationwide is due primarily to the fact that a disproportionate number of them graduate from third and fourth rate institutions.

This possibility, if largely true, could have enormous implications for colleges of teacher education. One approach would be to devise policies to shift more of teacher training to the higher quality institutions which, because of their higher selectivity, would likely result in an increase in the average quality indicators for teachers. Of course, it must be assumed that these higher quality institutions would retain their selectivity, even for teacher education students. However, even if the within-institution quality of teacher education students were slightly lower than the institutional average, the overall effect on quality would still be in an upward direction if more students were educated at the better institutions.

The goal of shifting more teacher education to higher

quality institutions could, of course, occur in a variety of ways. One way would be simply to close many of the lower quality institutions' teacher education programs. Indeed, this has been suggested, but the political problems would be enormous. Since the programs at these institutions are approved by state education departments, local political pressures would be brought to bear upon such departments were they to try to impose rigorous standards on such programs. Furthermore, as noted above, state departments of education are more likely to adopt practices allowing less rigorous standards than they are to tighten up on those standards. Because of the general distrust of colleges of education in their role of providing pedagogical training, the better colleges of education are tarred with the same brush as the weaker ones and policies are adopted which do not allow conditions under which more effective pedagogical training could be demonstrated.

A second way of attempting to shift more of teacher education to the high quality institutions would be for those institutions to expand their programs, maintain high standards for admission, and adopt measures to try to attract more students into teacher education. This tactic makes a good deal of sense because it can be combined with the improvements in teacher education which could flow from increased interaction with the liberal arts noted above. The higher-quality institutions also usually have higher quality liberal arts faculties which are currently suffering from some enrollment problems of their own. Such faculties may be enticed into cooperation with colleges of

education, both by the curricular challenges posed by redesigning teacher education programs as well as by the possibilities of increasing their own enrollments. Perhaps the time is ripe for such a marriage of convenience to actually produce qualitatively improved teacher education programs.

In any event, forces seem to be at work to break down the heretofore nearly monolithic structure of teacher education where the better programs have seldom been discriminated from the weaker programs. The time has come for the higher quality colleges of education to unite and begin collectively to define what a paradigm teacher education program should look like. If this entails that some of the weaker institutions in the education community no longer measure up, so be it. Indeed, there are indications that such efforts are already underway. The Association of Schools and Colleges of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities has begun to look at ways to define teacher education at the better universities. In addition, the so-called "Holmes Group", a collection of about twenty deans of education from among the most prestigious institutions in the country is meeting in an effort to set optimal standards for teacher education rather than resting content with minimal standards.

Any number of reformers have commented on the difficulty of attracting high-quality students into the teaching profession. On the whole, this is not something which colleges of education can address by themselves. The economic structure of the teaching profession and the low esteem in which teachers are

held, along with the attractive opportunities outside of teaching all work against high-quality students entering the teaching profession. There simply can no longer be any question that over the years American education was built by exploiting bright women shamelessly. For many years during the growth of universal public education, there were few professional opportunities for intelligent young women other than teaching and nursing. With the recent opening up of our social and economic system, these women now have many other opportunities and they are taking advantage of them.

At the same time, education has a very special advantage in attracting at least some students. Survey after survey, while noting widespread disillusionment by many teachers with much of teaching, reveals a real commitment to teaching. Most teachers are in teaching because they have a calling--it certainly is not for the money. Simply put, they enjoy working with children and helping them to develop and learn. This strain of idealism can be utilized, along with at least some minimal financial reforms, to attract high quality teachers.

There are already a number of scholarship programs in place to attract teachers and more are on the way. Where possible, local scholarships and incentives should be developed to supplement the state and federal initiatives, but these programs must emphasize quality rather than quantity. Unfortunately, marginal colleges of education have been even more aggressive in trying to attract students than have quality institutions. There seems to be nothing so attractive to the president of a marginal

institution than the belief that not only can anyone train teachers, but that it can be done inexpensively as well. If we are to improve the quality of teacher education, we must stop doing it in low-quality institutions, even if that means that many of them will go out of business.

CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:

A final area in which the reform movement has implications for colleges of teacher education is that of continuing professional development for teachers (Hanes and Rowls, 1984). Because of the centrality accorded to teachers and the teaching profession by much of the reform literature, the improvement of teaching occupies a central place as well. Although there are clear regional differences across the country in the relative emphasis to be placed on pre-service teacher training versus in-service training, everyone seems to agree that continuing development of teachers is essential. It is essential both to update teaching areas, e.g., in computers and computing software, and to improve teaching skills, e.g., in bringing the results of research on effective instruction to the classroom. Continuing professional development will be particularly important in the Northeast and Midwest where student populations are declining and where current teachers will be on the job for ten to twenty more years.

Colleges of education have, of course, always been concerned with continued professional development for teachers. The standard modes for such involvement have been graduate courses at

the colleges and workshops in the schools. Over the years, however, these methods of delivering continuing education have eroded considerably. Graduate courses will, of course, continue to have a place in the delivery system, but when most teachers in an area already have their master's degrees and are already at the top of the salary scale, the courses lose some of their attraction. In addition such courses are often designed for the benefit of the college of education rather than for the practicing teacher. They may not be up to date with respect to the current research, and, too often, the college professor talks down to the teacher.

Workshop sessions are often even worse. Typically, these are scheduled for a half day in the school and are put on by educational entrepreneurs who have developed an appealing style, but often without much substance to what they present. Teachers are tired, they are often forced to attend the workshops by their administrators and seldom is there the kind of follow-up which would be required for truly lasting change.

Both the traditional graduate course and the short workshop have come under increasing challenge by recent effective schools research. We have learned that lasting change takes time to implement and must be accepted by those who must implement it. Change, especially educational change, cannot be implemented by fiat. Furthermore, the effective unit of change seems to be the individual school building, aided by a strong educationally-oriented principal. Teachers who gather willy-nilly in a college classroom seldom have the commonality of interests that results in effective change.

We have also learned that the culture of the school is terribly important to how teachers perform. Study after study has shown that the effects on a teacher of the school climate far outweigh the effects of either college classroom instruction or student teaching experiences. The reality of the classroom and the mores of the school seem to swamp even the best teacher preparation programs.

What this indicates is that colleges of education must learn how to utilize one of the most important influences on teachers--the school climate in which the teachers work. Teacher preparation cannot stop at the edge of the campus when the prospective teacher receives a diploma. Rather a variety of means must be found to continue teacher preparation into the field with internships, master teachers, and long-term commitments to working in the field. Without going quite so far as the headline grabbing efforts of some colleges of education who are issuing one-year warranties to school districts who hire

their graduates, the idea of closer school-college partnerships is one that can and should be pursued.

Indeed, the reformist efforts to restructure the teaching profession to allow good teachers to stay in the classroom instead of having to go into administration to get a pay raise, can be turned to the advantage of colleges of education. So-called "master teachers" in the schools can be identified, given special training responsibilities, and made adjunct faculty of colleges of education. There is no question that there is a growing body of knowledge about what makes a good teacher. Much of this knowledge is produced in graduate schools of education and the other colleges of education should certainly be up to date on this research. At the same time, it is a long way between the research and reasonable implementation of it in the classroom. Master teachers who also know the research and who are themselves knowledgeable about the constraints of the classroom can be invaluable additions to the teacher preparation process. They can give a touch of reality to college courses and can continue the education of teachers via internships and intensive professional development activities when those teachers get into the classroom.

It should be noted that I am not here calling for a return to the old normal school approach to training teachers. The fact that practicing teachers have an important role to play in teacher preparation should be no more surprising than that medical schools require extensive internships and practical training along with their university instruction. Similarly in teacher education, there is excellent reason why teachers must continue to be trained in colleges and universities. It is only there that teachers will have the time and opportunity to reflect critically upon their chosen profession and to acquire the skills to become life-long learners in that profession. At the same time, however, it would be folly to continue to pretend that good teachers do not know a great deal about teaching and how to help other teachers become better.

All schools and colleges of education need to form long-lasting partnerships with schools nearby. Even the more prestigious graduate schools of education cannot remain above the fray. They can and should study education, but they must also remember that their scholarship must be thoroughly grounded in the real world of education. Scholarship in education is not simply "applied" psychology, or history, or philosophy, or administrative theory. The insights of those disciplines are of tremendous value for the study of education, but they are insights which must be grounded in a thorough appreciation of the practical affairs of education. If colleges of education take this seriously, new models of teacher education, both pre-service and in-service can be evolved in partnership with the schools and

the liberal arts faculties at the institutions of higher education.

SUMMARY:

Despite the fact that teacher education comes in for scant attention in the recent national reports on education, nevertheless, policy discussions and initiatives at the state and local level have more than redressed the lack. At the level of pedagogy there are forces at work that seem to assume that learning how to teach is simply unnecessary. To the contrary, I have urged that the question is not whether one will learn how to teach, but rather how one will learn how to teach. Efforts must be undertaken to improve courses in pedagogy utilizing connections with the liberal arts and recent educational research or else colleges of education will find themselves increasingly under attack, and justifiably so.

Certification procedures must be improved and colleges of education must take the lead in insisting on higher standards. Research must be undertaken to demonstrate the efficacy of reflective pedagogical training as contrasted with certifying any liberal arts graduate who wants to teach. If we are convinced that we can teach teachers how to teach, let us prove it.

Tests, too, will have an important impact on teacher education. At the extreme, test scores of graduates of teacher preparation programs may be used to phase some of those programs out of existence. At a minimum, colleges of education must begin to overcome the widespread view that they are intellectually

barren and attract only the weakest students. Some colleges of education are very good indeed, and they should say so. Others are fully deserving of the scorn heaped upon them, and they should be closed down. Teachers must have minimal competency and complaints about the problems with tests do not in the long run do teachers or colleges of education any good. The limits of testing as a policy tool must be recognized, but where tests are appropriate, as in certifying minimal general knowledge, they must not be mindlessly resisted.

Any given institution can probably attract teacher education students of about the same quality as the institution as a whole. What this means is that the low overall quality indicators for teachers may be due to the fact that a disporportionate number of them are coming from third and fourth rate institutions. Higher quality programs can no longer permit themselves to be lumped with lower quality programs as if there were no differences worth noting. Indeed, in my view perhaps a third to a half of current teacher preparation programs should be shut down. State education departments will be reluctant to take such steps, but the better colleges of education can apply the pressure by insisting on rigorous standards and measurable results in their own programs.

Finally, the need for developing new models of continuing professional development for teachers has never been more apparent nor more amenable to action. Colleges of education should cooperate closely with their liberal arts colleagues and with schools in devising new programs that make use of the

expertise to be found in all three areas. Master teachers associated with colleges and universities should be the rule rather than the exception.

Colleges of education have a great deal at stake in the current wave of educational reform. If they take advantage of their opportunities, they can emerge stronger and more respected. If they fail, they may yet go out of business entirely. The critics are many and the friends are few. In order to take advantage of their opportunities, the colleges of education must basically do three things. First, they must cooperate as they have never done before, both with schools and with the liberal arts colleges on their campuses. Second, they must go to work on their curriculum, improving it where possible, jettisoning it where necessary. There is no reason that education courses should not be viewed as among the most intellectually stimulating and demanding in the university. And last, but not least, colleges of education must somehow clean up their own act. There are too many of them of marginal and below marginal quality. If they do not begin to impose higher standards on themselves, such standards will be imposed upon them by people who do not understand the difference between a good college of education and a poor one. Thus, the most important lesson of the educational reform movement for colleges of education may be that they need to reform themselves. Let us hope that they have the will to succeed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alter, Jonathan, McCormick, John, and Joseph, Nadine. "Why Teachers Fail," Newsweek, 24 Sept. 1984, pp. 64-70.

Berliner, David .C. "Making The Right Changes In Preservice Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1984, pp. 94-97.

Boyer, Ernest L. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. New York: Harper & Row, 1983.

Business-Higher Education Forum. America's Competitive Challenge: The Need for a National Response. Washington: Business-Higher Education Forum,1983.

College Board, The. Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1983.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. "Taking the Measure of Excellence: The Case Against Basing Teacher Evaluation on Student Test Scores," American Educator, Fall, 1984, pp.26-29.

Feistritzer, C. Emily. The Making of a Teacher: A Report on Teacher Education and Certification. National Center for Education Information, 1984.

Gage, N.L. "What Do We Know About Teaching Effectiveness?" Phi Delta Kappan, October 1984, pp. 87-93.

Goodlad, John I. A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future. New York: McGraw Hill, 1983.

Hanes, Madlyn Levine, and Rowls, Michael D. "Teacher Recertification: A Survey of the States," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1984, pp.123-126.

Ishler, Richard E. "Requirements for Admission to and Graduation from Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1984, pp.121-122.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington: US Department of Education, 1983.

New York State Board of Regents. Action Plan to Improve Elementary and Secondary Education Results in New York. Albany: The State Education Department, 1984.

Paideia Group. The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto. New York: Macmillan, 1982.

Sizer, Theodore R. Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.

State Education Department, New York, Certification Information, Fall 1983.

Stedman, Lawrence C., and Smith, Marshall S. "Recent Reform Proposals for American Education," Contemporary Education Review, vol.2, 1983.

Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1983.

Task Force on the Role of the Liberal Arts in Teacher Education. (Draft report). Association of Schools and Colleges of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities, 1984.

Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy. Making the Grade. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1983.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN TEACHER EDUCATION

HEARINGS - NEW YORK CITY - October 19, 1984

Washington Square Campus of New York University, Bachman Auditorium, Tisch Hall, 20 West Fourth Street

COMMENTS BY:

Gladys M. Hannon
Community Superintendent
Community School District 2
210 East 33 Street
New York, New York 10016

An ad-hock group calling itself the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth recently placed a full-page ad. in TIME magazine to say, "It's time to stop talking about education," and to ask, rhetorically, "Isn't it time something was done? It exhorts individuals, organizations and business men great and small to pitch in and help.

Such laudable intentions could have useful consequences if public education needed a little sprucing up here and there, and its practitioners a friendly helping hand once in a while. But if we are dealing not with malaise but with deep malady, band-aid or cosmetic treatment can do more harm than good, lulling some into believing that they are addressing the problem, that they are doing something, something for "a nation at risk" because of a faltering public education system.

The Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, like all good teachers, frames the most cogent questions simply and clearly. Implicit in these questions is the premise that if we are to have better schools we must have better teachers.

Question I: Teacher education:

What is it, what does it do, how does it function and who is responsible for it.

Question II:

What is the status of teacher education, and what direction should it take?

Question III:

What can the specific groups responsible for ... teacher education do to improve it?

All three add up to simply: How can we (attract) get better teachers?

Let us start at the beginning, with those who wish to enter the teaching profession. What beyond their desire to do so is involved in their embarking upon this course? We have it on unimpeachable authority that you can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. And the teaching profession needs the former, not the latter. It needs people of both intelligence and at home with ideas, eager to advance their own scholarship and able to communicate effectively by reading, writing and speaking in the language of instruction. It also helps if they have somewhat of a sense of mission.

If we have this, we stand fair to having it all; if we lack one part of it, we have nothing.

Without going into reasons, which invariably lead to recriminations and rancor, we ask of our teachers' colleges and universities whether those they accept to receive degrees and then certif~~ication~~ as teachers are often merely fodder for college programs and then for classrooms in need of somebody called a teacher. We understand that this is not an easy task especially in the face of increasing demands for additional teachers in Early Childhood/elementary education and curriculum areas such as Science/Math.

We suggest that institutions preparing teachers accept only those capable of becoming teachers. Academe has learned much--perhaps too much--from the market place; can they learn that if the products they turn out are good, teachers will command greater respect and remuneration. Debased standards, being "practical" about qualifying people as teachers, is not the only cause of our present woe, but it contributes mightily.

Given the right candidates for the teaching profession, colleges and universities cannot of themselves make teachers of them. These institutions can nourish and expand the qualifications a candidate possesses, adapt them to the teaching process, and flesh them out with courses in educational psychology and methodology.

Whatever a training institution can do to prepare a would-be teacher for classroom service, one thing stands out as what they must not do; that is, delude him into believing that he has learned to teach, that he is trained. The fate that awaits such a believer is illustrated by a story Heywood Brown's essay: "The Fifty-First Dragon. "Gawaine le Coeur Hardy goes to Knight School to become a dragon-slayer. He is taught theory, and he practices on dummy fire-snorters. Vaguely troubled that real dragons could be far more dangerous than the dummies, Gawaine is told that to ensure success with the real ones, he must shout the magic word Rumpelsnitz,,as he attacks Forty-nine dragons fall to his sword, but when he encounters the fiftieth, the fiercest of them all, he forgets the magic word but kills the dragon anyhow. The realization that he had never had a magic word but had risked his life under a delusion so unnerves him that when he meets a puny little dragon who can hardly puff at him, Gawaine stands transfixed, and is burned to a crisp.

* * *

Teacher education does not end when one receives a degree; it begins then. It is from the time one enters the classroom to teach that one needs direct and meaningful assistance, not of the Rumpelsnitz variety. Teacher training institutions must be prepared to meet this need, at least to a considerable extent, with a comprehensive in-service program worked out collaborating with teachers. These institutions have the advantages of greater objectivity, wider perspective, access to research, and the power of their prestige to draw upon. Yet they must become increasingly conscious of a teacher's day to day concerns.

Collaborative action between colleges and the public schools is not unknown, but neither is it universal, as it should be.

Here are some programs which represent steps in the right direction:

- Houston Independent Schools-Quality Assurance Program in cooperation with community Colleges.
- Principal's Institute at Harvard University
- Teacher Centers as established by teacher associations and union groups enunciating the peer tutoring aspect of learning.
- University of Virginia model of teacher training that guarantees to a receiving school district additional support to the newly certified teacher if the goals of the school are not being met.
- Toledo plan for professional development credit
- Teachers College Training Evaluation and School Services Project

Colleges must learn how to work with the schools, the site of true teacher mastery.

One area particularly interesting to those now intent upon "doing something" about education is teacher supervision, and, in connection with it, the concept of the master teacher. So much has been said, --and undoubtedly will continue to be said with greater and greater volubility--on this subject, that we can safely conclude that every viewpoint will be thoroughly examined. I wish here merely to make a few remarks on the issue, maybe offer some self- evident truths:

- Supervision is one thing if the teachers being supervised are of the calibre we set down as able to be teachers. It is another thing if they have been made of sows' ears. Those able to be teachers can be further enabled; the others cannot.

- It is in the classroom that a teacher-candidate becomes a teacher, and then only if somebody is learning from him. He becomes a better teacher as he learns on the job. There is no need for each teacher to invent the wheel; he can profit enormously from the experience of others, but only if he finds in such vicarious experience both immediacy and relevancy to his own particular dilemma.

. The function of the staff developer and that of the evaluator are in frequent conflict. To the extent that evaluation, which means judgment by standards, is vigorously and arbitrarily applied, to that extent is it inimical to the teacher's growth as a creative and effective communicator with his students.A supervisor with such rigid standards is a disciple of Procrustes of classical mythology, whose bed measured all who came his way, with stretching or amputation the fate of all who did not fit.

. A model lesson can serve to show a teacher the conditions under which one teaches in Utopia, resulting in cynicism when he considers his own situation. To paraphrase the poet, a teacher will think: If what I am being told is not good for me, what care I how good it be?

. Great teachers are not clones of other great teachers. Socrates did not teach Plato how to teach, nor Plato Aristotle. They learned the philosophy of teaching from one another successively, but each developed on his own, using what he had learned from his teacher.

- The apparatus for master teachers has always been in place in our public schools, but this apparatus is not always now used for the purpose it was designed for.

- The term "principal teacher" -- now shortened to "principal" was designed to apply to a head master whose job definition was pegged to assisting and enabling the others of the school staff to teach more effectively. Again, like the college professor, he had broader perspective on an individual teacher's strengths and problems in terms of the school as an entity. He also had the power administratively to adjudicate and adjust some of the difficulties.

Amidst the complexities and pressures of school management today, principals find it very difficult to regard staff development as their principal function. We think a reassessment of the role of the principal as a "built-in" master teacher is now called for. Let's call it "back to basics."

If we are really to "do something" now about education, our teacher training institutions must

- admit only viable candidates;
- do the groundwork for their development as teachers; and
- become deeply and steadily involved in the practice in the classrooms.

The solution for the making of a teacher, the making of a master teacher and the making of the principal-teacher is the obligation of the teacher training institutions.

It requires all our efforts and our attention. The partnership approach that allows for teacher input, system-wide articulation and on-going assistance by the training institution and perhaps in its most natural setting, the school, will provide the ideal opportunities for the professional development of the entire school staff.

In "The Wayfarer," Stephen Crane tells about a man in quest of truth, a wayfarer.

P O E M

If indeed the way to truth is arduous, let us not take other ways because they are easier. If we do, we will again and again arrive at the realization that education in our public schools is more and more at risk.

Testimony

before the

National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education

by

Robert A. Burnham

Dean and Professor

School of Education, Health, Nursing, & Arts Professions

New York University

October 19, 1984

First, as Dean of SEHNAP, I personally, and on behalf of the Faculty of the School, extend a sincere welcome to you the National Commission Members. As the host for these Commission Sessions, I also welcome and greet all the participants and witnesses here today.

A vital role of the University is to provide a forum for informed discussions that we hope will lead to solutions to some of society's most vexing problems. Thus, we at NYU are most pleased to host the Commission's Sessions.

These Commission activities are clear evidence that all of us involved in teacher preparation are embarked on a serious effort to find ways to improve educator preparation in the United States.

At the outset, I would like to commend Prof. Bob Egbert and Dr. Dave Imig for their foresight and initiatives leading to this national effort. At the local level, I thank Prof. Ted Repa of NYU who took full charge of arrangements for the Commission visit to New York City. Thanks, also, to one of our graduate students, Chet Lesniak, who carried out the arrangement details in a most efficient manner.

I am sure the Commission will hear considerable testimony on ways to improve teacher preparation from the experts assembled here today. Since my area of expertise is the administration of complex organizations, I will limit most of my brief remarks to (1) the organizational context in which teaching takes place, and (2) the selection and development of school-building-level leadership.

For the record, I support fifth year, masters'-level requirements for preservice teacher education. These fifth year programs should be founded on the extant and emerging knowledge bases that tell us much about teaching and teaching effectiveness. "Curricular integration" may well be the key phrase of the next decade. With a burgeoning number of validated ways to enhance teacher effectiveness, new research-based knowledge, and advancing technologies all to be incorporated into our preparation programs, we must rethink and reintegrate our teacher preparation curricula. That, to me, is the essence of the teacher education reform.

Many of the improvements in teacher education, however, will be negated if we do not, simultaneously, vastly improve the identification, selection, preparation, and continuing development of school administrators. Basic reform is needed in schools, colleges, and departments of education having supervisory and administrator preparation programs. We must shift beyond the training of managers of the status quo. Greater attention must be given to the cultivation of educational leadership from among the ranks of successful, effective teachers. We need fresh approaches to the development of organizational leadership. The excessively constrained and circumscribed organization represented by bureaucratic conditions in many elementary and secondary schools, simply is not a conducive environment for the new breed of teacher we envision will be prepared in the future.

The middle management personnel, e.g. supervisors, department heads, and principals, as curriculum leaders must be well suited and well trained in effective team leadership techniques, in staff motivation, group consensus building, and educational policy implementation.

There is considerable research on organizational excellence and development that can guide curriculum improvement in the leadership area. Much of this new understanding involves risk taking, and having an outcome or performance orientation versus a process/procedural orientation.

The purpose of the changes I am suggesting is to empower the teachers and administrators in the local schools to serve as true professionals. This means delegating authority and responsibility throughout the school system. The resources necessary to carry out essential functions should be vested as close to the scene of action--the classroom--as possible. If teachers and principals are to be held accountable for their performance, then school level budgeting, curriculum planning, and funding are required.

Overall coordination and balancing of curricula across a school system is necessary, but much more latitude should be given to building level personnel. They should be free to exercise their professional judgment on many matters frequently considered the domain of central administration.

Any such changes in the school organization must be preceded by a restructuring of management and leadership programs. On-the-job training is a poor substitute for the systematic reform I see as needed to produce educational leadership. On-the-job training may only reinforce the status quo, since much of it involves intensive orientation to, and defense of the existing system.

I reserve the right to amend and extend my remarks. I will present the Commission with a written statement. Thank you for your attention.

Testimony before the

National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education

of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education

Regional Hearing

New York City, NY

October 19, 1984

Dr. J. Lynn Griesemer
Executive Director
Northeast Regional Exchange, Inc.
34 Littleton Road
Chelmsford, MA 01824

Distinguished commissioners of this panel, I am honored by your invitation to present at the hearing of the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, sponsored by the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. These key points that I present to the Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education come naturally from my experiences as a teacher; an administrator in elementary, secondary, and higher education; more recently, my experience of working with state departments of education and institutions of higher education in this region as Executive Director of the Northeast Regional Exchange in Chelmsford, Massachusetts; and my tendency to view education as a business.

The focus of the Commission's work is teacher education. By my definition, teacher education is a life-long process that starts with a society that values and supports the continued development of good teachers or educators. This means that we must work collectively to:

- improve the manner in which we portray educators and education in our society

- rethink and reinvest in preservice and inservice training of educators, and

- develop a better working relationship among those involved in teacher education -- that is within and among institutions of higher education, intermediate service units, teacher centers, professional associations, state departments of education, and regional organizations like NEREX.

Today, I have chosen to focus my comments on institutions of higher education and what I feel are the actions they must take to recapture a more respected place in society as part of the life-long process of teacher education. The type of actions that I speak about are taking place in some public and private colleges and universities, but must become more widely adopted throughout the country.

As mentioned previously, I have come to view education as a business, and higher education is no exception. Improving education is the service we provide, and for IHE's, this means improving the way we teach and train educators. Our clients are the future and present teachers and administrators in our elementary and secondary schools. Perhaps for the universities involved in doctoral programs, we should also include the professors and administrators in our higher education institutions as our clients.

Whether we endorse the idea of "public measures" or not, the success of our product is measured in the marketplace by student and teacher outcomes that should be broadly interpreted to include academic, social, emotional, and economic gains during a person's lifetime.

Pushing my business analogy a step further, one might consider some institutions of higher education and colleges of teacher education as the wide-bodied, gas-eating Chryslers of the late 60's and early 70's. We also recognize that there are some colleges/universities and other organizations that offer preservice training and particularly inservice training that look more like the small, energy-efficient German and Japanese cars that flood our highways. The challenge those of us face who are involved in the reform of teacher education as offered by institutions of higher education is very similar to the issues that have confronted Lee Iaccoca over the last several years. If one accepts the analogy, it is apparent that the business of reforming teacher education as conducted by colleges/universities must begin with internal realignment, so that the services that we market to our clients are more relevant and, thus, yield greater long-term profits.

1. We should begin our internal realignment with a market analysis

   - Which client groups do we want to capture?

   - How do we want to shape our clients expectations of our product?

   - What course components have the greatest relevance to this client group?

   - How must we package our product? (i.e., short-term, on-site courses; evening and weekend mini-courses; standard 10- or 15-week courses)

2. We must re-examine our reward system so that we not only promote those who publish in scholarly journals that teachers do not read, but reward our researchers who demonstrate how their research applies to practice through the development of

   - better instructional materials and procedures

   - better teacher and administrator training programs.

   - better school finance plans and

   - better-conceived federal, state, and local school policy.

3. Equally, we must reward our teaching faculty and those whom we pay to provide on-site services (i.e., curriculum development, policy assistance, evaluation).

4. As we develop systems to reward outstanding performance in the teaching ranks, we must simultaneously identify, prepare, and promote into management positions only those who demonstrate leadership skills.

5. We must develop procedures to actively test our prototypes and evaluate our services and redesign next year's model.

Let me assure you, I am not naive about the world of higher education. I know a large portion of our faculties are tenured, and many of those hold the rank of "full professor." Our budgets are shrinking, and our enrollments do not justify increased appropriations.

When Mr. Iaccoca was presented with the realities, similar to those that deans and presidents of colleges and universities face, he was able to turn the Chrysler Corporation around with the help of one of the most powerful unions in the country and included in his approach the retraining of a workforce in robotics. He had to make some tough choices -- and appropriate a higher percentage of his scarce resources to research, staff renewal, testing of prototypes, and eventually advertising.

My position is very simple; in order for us to make a commitment to renewing teacher education partially through institutions of higher education, we must make a commitment to renew our colleges of education and the faculty who teach there. If we do not take the appropriate internal actions to regain our share and respect in this market, we will be even less able to lead or even respond to reform movements and market demands of the future.

October 19, 1984

Testimony by: Robert F. Eagan
President
Connecticut Education Association

Presented to: The National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education
New York City University
Bachman Auditorium, Tisch Building
40 West 4th Street
New York City, New York

RE: Improving Teacher Education

M. Chairperson:

I am Robert F. Eagan, President of the Connecticut Education Association speaking on behalf of our 26,000 members and our colleagues of the Vermont Education Association.

In 1977, Robert N. Bush of Stanford University published an article entitled, "We Know How to Train Teachers: Why Not Do So!" In that article, he stated:

> ". . . excellent teacher training requires money. It is not cheap . . . teacher education has always been the cheapest of almost all programs, both for those who want to enter and for the institutions who offer it. Strong social forces work to keep it that way. But we now have demonstrated that high quality teacher training is possible when resources are available. We need to take the lesson seriously."

Professor Bush's observation is as valid today as when it was written seven years ago. In fact, in all of the clamor for reform in education, none of us can afford to lose sight of this one fact: No substantive improvement will be made in either the training of teachers or in public education unless there is the advancement, upfront, of the money to match the rhetoric for improvement. In short, the status of teachers and teacher training institutions must be elevated and that will not happen unless colleges of education receive their necessary share from college and university budgets. Unless, therefore, there is the fundamental commitment of money to teacher training institutions, to the graduates of these institutions, and to the schools in which certified teachers will teach, then we are involved in a futile dance of hollow words.

Assuming, however, that there shall be action resulting in increased funding, there are some key changes which must be adopted to improve and enhance the improvement of teacher education. I offer the following suggestions as being necessary for effective change:

1. Rigorous requirements must be established and met by every prospective student who desires to enter teacher education programs.
2. Students allowed into teacher education programs must have a solid foundation in liberal arts and some background in their teaching specialty.
3. Students in teacher training must be continually evaluated through a variety of assessment techniques.

4. Colleges of education and schools in which teachers teach must participate directly and more cooperatively in the training of teachers.
5. Time must be rearranged and committed to the training of prospective teachers, to the constructive criticism of their practice, and for collaboration between schools and colleges.
6. Teacher training programs must be more sensitive to, and responsive to the real needs of students and teachers. And,
7. The teaching profession itself, like other recognized professions, must have exclusive control over the standards and practices of its profession.

We also maintain that successful teacher education cannot be achieved or implemented without addressing the training of school administrators. In short, prospective school administrators, too, must meet more rigorous standards and an expanded program designed to increase their skills in personnel selection, staff evaluation, cooperative decision making, and effective human relations.

Finally, we contend that there must not only be greater fiscal resources committed to education research, but there also must be more direct application of the findings from that research to pedagogic training.

In conclusion, I must repeat my initial point: Money is needed to accomplish improvement in teacher education. When that money is provided, I am confident that changes can be adopted which will lead to the improvement of teacher training and practice.

Thank you.

October 19, 1984

Testimony by: Donna Chapin
Teacher
Sherman, Connecticut

and

Member
Board of Education
Shepaug Valley Regional School District #12
Washington, Connecticut

Presented to: The National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education
New York City University
Bachman Auditorium, Tish Building
40 West 4th Street
New York City, New York

RE: Improving Teacher Education

M. Chairperson:

I am Donna Chapin, a third grade teacher in a school system of twenty teachers in Sherman, Connecticut. Additionally, I am a member of the Board of Education of the Shepaug Valley Regional School District #12 in Washington, Connecticut. Thus, I come before you today as an individual with the perspective of a teacher, school board member, and, last but not least, a parent.

Improving teacher education is, at the moment, only one facet in the overall cry for reform in education in our state and country. It is, for the time being, a subject caught in the spotlight of the public. I can assure you, however, that it has been a continous and prime concern by the members of my profession ever since I entered college twenty years ago. In light of this, I have mixed feelings. On the one hand, I am pleased with the attention education is receiving. Yet, on the other hand, I am less than convinved that real change will take place. I say

this because many of the reforms being proposed today have been the subject of educational writers, scholars, and teachers for as long as I can remember. Had those in positions of power heeded the call for change and action voiced by my profession over the last twenty years, we would not be here today.

I want to speak to you specifically from the perspective of having been, at one time, a student teacher. And, I want to speak to you from the perspective of having been, more recently, a supervisor of a student teacher. Let me be very candid and say that, in the years which have intervened between these two personal experiences of mine, there has not been much change. The conditions and practices remain about the same. In both instances, the time and money allocated for student teaching and the supervision of student teachers has remained about the same and so, too, has the end result.

My number one plea for the improvement of teacher education must be forcused upon time and money; time for the student teacher to become truly prepared for effective teaching from their first day of employment, and money to support the accomplishment of this goal.

To put it as simply as I can, let me say that prospective teachers need more than a few weeks in a student teacher experience. From the very first day one is admitted into a teacher preparation program, that person needs to have ongoing, consistent and meaningful contact with the actual classroom. She or he must also have a variety of experiences in teaching situations and methodologies in a panorama of different and divergent school settings. There must be the opportunity for direct application of knowledge gained in content and teaching methods. And, there must be persistent counselling and coaching from college personnel and experienced teacher practitioners. These are basic requirements which must be considered in the training of teachers.

At the same time, those empowered with the responsibility of supervising student teachers must have time to prepare, evaluate, and implement a sound program for student teachers. Supervising teacher practitioners must have adequate time for meaningful consultation with the prospective teachers with whom they are working. There must be time, too, for more frequent dialogue with the teacher training institutions. Finally, there must be placed into practice greater collaboration by all members of the profession in the preparation of teachers.

Time to implement the fundamental changes is not without its price tag. Teacher training institutions implementing such changes would have to have more money than they now receive and the same is true for participating school districts. If more money is not allocated for such changes, then it would be foolish to anticipate improvement in teacher education.

I also must add this: There are no short cuts in building a sound, effective teacher training program. The training of teachers is every bit as important as the training of doctors, lawyers, dentists, and architects. Teachers, afterall, work with the most important element of the human being, a person's mind. I believe our children's minds deserve the best that money and time can buy.

In conclusion, I would like to underscore and emphasize my agreement with the presentation of Mary Dilworth of the NAACP, who effectively stated the very real implications resulting from relying upon a simple test or tests, to determine who should enter and/or remain teaching. Additionally, immediate strategies must be explored to curtail the loss of women and minorities from entering and remaining in teaching.

Thank you.